

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings on the basis that the drawings do not include reference character 118 mentioned in the specification. The Examiner also objected to the drawings on the basis that the drawings do not include reference character 10 in Figs. 9 and 10 and reference character 117 in Fig. 4.

New drawing sheets are submitted herewith, which include reference character 118 in Figs. 4, 7 and 8. A new drawing sheet containing Fig. 9 replaces the reference character "10" with "20", and a new drawing sheet containing Fig. 4 replaces the reference character "117" with "120." The Examiner's careful review of the drawings and specification is noted with appreciation.

The Examiner also noted an error on page 5, line 6 of the specification, which is corrected by this response.

The Examiner noted numerous language issues in connection with claims 2, 6, 10, 14, 20, 21, 23 and 25. In addition, the Examiner objected to claim 18 for failing to limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Certain of these claims have been canceled by this response and, with respect to the remaining claims, the matters of language noted by the Examiner have been addressed.

Claims 1-9, 11-14 and 16-24 were rejected under 35 USC section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. The Examiner pointed out instances of incorrect

claim language, which have been addressed and corrected by this response. Again, the Examiner's careful review of the claims is noted with appreciation.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-10, 21, 23 and 25 were rejected under 35 USC section 102(b) as being anticipated by US patent 4,923,158 to Saisho. Claims 1 and 3-6 were rejected under 35 USC section 102(b) as being anticipated by US patent 5,163,795 to Benoit et al. Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 USC section 102(b) as being anticipated by US patent 3,385,150 72 to Rapata. Claims 1, 4 and 8 were rejected under 35 USC section 102(e) as being anticipated by US patent 6,915,993 to O'Leary. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 USC section 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Leary in view of Rapata. Claims 3, 5, 15 and 17-19 were rejected under 35 USC section 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Leary in view of Benoit. Claims 11, 12, 22, 24 and 26 were rejected under 35 USC section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saisho in view of Rapata. Claim 13 was rejected under 35 USC section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saisho in view of Rapata, and further in view of Benoit et al. Claims 7, 14 and 20 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 USC section 112, second paragraph, and to include all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By this response, claims 7, 14 and 20 are amended to independent form, in each case incorporating the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and to address the rejections under 35 USC section 112, second paragraph. In view of the Examiner's indication, it is thus believed that claims 7, 14 and 20 are in allowable form, along with claims 16 and 17, which are amended to depend from claim 20.

By this response, claims 9, 15, 18, 19 and 21-26 have been canceled. The remaining claims have been amended in a manner believed to patentably define over the references.

Claim 1 is amended so as to positively claim the furniture support member, which is defined as having a lower portion that extends parallel to a support surface and which defines a downwardly facing arcuate outer surface having an opening defined by an edge. In addition, claim 1 calls for a glide for connection to the lower portion of the support member. The glide is defined as having a body with an arcuate inner engagement surface. The arcuate inner engagement surface is defined as having a curvature that matches that of the downwardly facing arcuate outer surface defined by the lower portion of the support member. In addition, claim 1 is amended to state that engagement of the mounting boss sections with the edge of the opening, in response to movement of the wedge into the passage defined by the body and the mounting boss sections, functions to maintain the arcuate inner engagement surface of the body against the downwardly facing arcuate outer surface defined by the lower portion of the support member.

The prior art does not show or suggest the subject matter of amended claim 1. The Saisho reference discloses a bottom portion 21 which is flat, and a body 1 which defines a flat upper edge that engages the flat bottom portion 21. The O'Leary reference contains a similar disclosure. Similarly, the Benoit et al. reference discloses a flat head member 20 which is used to secure flat panels 12 together. The Rapata reference discloses a plastic fastener that is used to secure panels 58, 60 together. While Rapata shows in Fig. 7 a panel 58c that is curved, Rapata does not show or suggest a glide having a body with an arcuate inner engagement surface which has a curvature that matches that of the downwardly facing arcuate outer surface defined by the lower portion of a support member, as claimed.

For the above reasons, claim 1 is believed to patentably define over the prior art, and is thus allowable. Claims 2-6 and 8 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, and are thus


also believed allowable for the above reasons as well as in view of the subject matter of each claim.

Claim 10 has been amended along the same lines as claim 1. For the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1, it is thus believed that claim 10 also patentably defines over the references, and is allowable along with its dependent claims 11-13.

Applicant's attorney has made every effort to place the application into condition for allowance with claims 1-8, 10-14, 16, 17 and 20, and such action is earnestly requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned by phone if questions remain after consideration of this response, or if such would otherwise facilitate prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Andrew S. McConnell
Reg. No. 32,272

Boyle Fredrickson, S.C.
840 North Plankinton Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53203
(414) 225-9755
Customer No.: 23598